DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 254 HE 006 624

AUTHOR Romano, Francis A.
TITLE An Examination of the Political Processes Involved in the Development of the Student Class Attendance Policy at Trenton State College.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 75
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Activism; Attendance Patterns; *Class Attendance; College Students; *Educational Policy; *Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS Baldridge Political Model; *Trenton State College

ABSTRACT

The political processes involved in the policy system of the college are examined and are considered important because the students have become legitimately involved in the policy-making process. The student class attendance policy was studied, based on interviews and study of documents related to the development of the policy. Sixteen major figures involved in the policy development were interviewed according to an interview instrument designed through the use of Baldridge's Political Model. The model concerned five areas of policy development analysis: (1) Social Structure Features, (2) Interest Articulation Processes, (3) Legislative Phases, (4) Policy Outcomes, and (5) Policy Execution. Results of the interviews and the examination of the documents were analyzed through the use of the Baldridge Model. The findings revealed the major reasons for the development of the policy, the conflicts that occurred between the constituencies, the compromises that were made, and the legislative processes involved in the development of the policy. The results also support various recommendations for the improvement of student involvement in the policy-making process and the improvement of the total policy system of the college. (Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111254

AN EXAMINATION OF THE POLITICAL PROCESSES INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT CLASS ATTENDANCE POLICY AT TRENTON STATE COLLEGE

EDUCATIONAL POLICY SYSTEMS

by

Francis A. Romano, M.S.

Trenton State College

DR. KENNETH VARCOE
CLUSTER COORDINATOR

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

MARCH 31, 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IHE 006621

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	2
PROCEDURES	7
RESULTS	9
CONCLUSIONS	21
RECOMMENDATIONS	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	23

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to provide the students of Trenton State College, particularly members of the Student Government Association, with an understanding of the political processes involved in the development of institutional policy. Since students have become more involved in the policy-making process of the college, it is important that they understand the policy system process and their role and impact as a political force. However, in order for such an understanding to be complete, the students must become aware of the role and impact of other political forces within the college and how these forces interact within the policy development system.

In order to accomplish this objective, the study has examined and analyzed the development of the Student Class Attendance Policy which was approved by the Board of Trustees on October 29, 1974 and became effective on January 20, 1975. This particular policy was selected for this study because it represented the most significant involvement of students in the policy development system of the college in recent years.

The very nature and purpose of the study required an analytical approach that was best served by the utilization of Dr. Victor Baldridge's Political Model. This model involves five points of analysis which include: 1) Social Structure Features, 2) Interest Articulation Processes, 3) Legislative Phases, 4) Policy Outcomes and 5) Policy Execution.[1] These five points are defined as follows:

1. Social Structure: A configuration of social groups with basically different life-styles and political interests. The crucial point is that the differences often lead to conflict, for what is in the interest of one group may damage another.

---

[1]Victor J. Baldridge, Power and Conflict in the University, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971), p. 23.

2. Interest Articulation: Groups with conflicting values and goals must somehow translate them into effective influence if they are to obtain favorable action by legislative bodies.

3. Legislative Phases: The dynamics by which articulated interests are translated into policies.

4. Policy Outcomes: The articulated interests have gone through conflict and compromise stages and the final legislative action is taken.

5. Policy Execution: The resulting policy is turned over to the bureaucrats for execution and implementation. However, the execution of policy frequently causes feedback which generates new tensions, new vested interests and a new cycle of conflict.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The importance of this study lies with the fact that the student body of Trenton State College has become, in recent years, a political force within the policy development system. Prior to 1968, the student body had little, if any, involvement in the development of policy. This limited involvement was primarily due to the bureaucratic structure of the college. However, in spite of this structure, the faculty role in policy-making was not as limited as that of the students role. Faculty members served on standing committees of the college and exercised influence on the administrative decisions on policy-making.

With the advent of collective bargaining and the organization of a Faculty Senate in 1968, the bureaucratic structure of the college changed. This permitted greater faculty participation in policy-making and the governance of the college. The formation of the Faculty Senate was also beneficial for the student body because its action provided increased opportunities for student participation in policy development.

One of the Senate's first actions was a general review and reordering of the standing committees of the college. This not only resulted in equal distribution of committee membership according to schools and

divisions of the college, but it also resulted in the appointment of students to every standing committee of the college with voting privileges. The only exception was the Promotions Committee where the student members would be consulted, but would not be permitted to vote on an individual member of the faculty who was being considered for promotion.[2]

The appointment of students to the standing committees of the college was the first real step toward the legitimate involvement of students in policy development. The second significant step toward student involvement was the formation of the Student Government Association in 1973. This organization consists of an Executive Committee, The President's Advisory Board, The President's Staff and the Student Senate. The Student Senate provides a forum for the synthesis of student opinion so that participation by students in policy-making will be effective and representative of the total student body.[3]

Full participation in all legislative and policy-making bodies and service on all committees gives students a more thorough working knowledge of their institution than any handbook.[4] Therefore, one would expect that the student achievements toward participation in policy development would prove beneficial for the college. However, meaningful participation in college and university government is not guaranteed merely by the presence of students on committees.[5]

---

[2] Joseph Carroll and others, A Report of the Policy Study Commission of Trenton State College, (New Jersey: TSC Printing, 1974), p. 132.

[3] Ibid., p. 138.

[4] R. S. Jenks, "Faculty-Student Participation in University Government: A Case History," Educational Record: LIV (Summer, 1973), p. 238.

[5] L. C. Hawes and H. R. Trux, "Student Participation in the University Decision Making Process," Journal of Higher Education: XLV (February, 1974), p. 124.

The Policy Study Commission of Trenton State College found that comparatively few students attend and participate in policy-making even though they are official members of various groups. On some occassions, the Commission found that some students raised the question of student power without realizing the extent to which they are supposed to be involved and the support they have from the College President and the college community as a whole.[6] A study of one university revealed four factors that tended to inhibit meaningful participation of students on committees. They included the student's limited representation, irregular attendance, scant orientation to committee tasks and inadequate means for discussing committee proposals with fellow students.[7] Jenks points out that students participating in the policy-making process often become frustrated because they have no idea how the system works and therefore they are unable to make the system work for them.[8]

Another problem is that students have a different time perspective than faculty and administrators since one-fourth of the student's university stay passes by each year. Therefore, students consider it important that faculty and administrators respond quickly to pressing issues. When the response is not quick enough or delayed indefinitely, the students lose faith in the system.[9] This often results from an ineffective flow of communications and a lack of serious recognition of student participation in policy development.

The exercise of shared authority by faculty, administrators, students

---

[6]Carroll, op. cit., p. 133.

[7]Ruth E. Eckert, "Participation in University Policy-Making: A Second Look," AAUP Bulletin: LVI (September, 1970), p. 310-312.

[8]Jenks, op. cit., p. 238.

[9]Ibid.

and board members in university government requires tolerance, respect and a sense of community which arises or should arise from the participation of all in a common cause.[10] Communication, shared authority and interdependent responsibility are essential to the shaping of norms and goals which guide institutional planning and performance.[11]

Ideally, all members of the college community should work together toward the establishment of a set of clearly identified educational goals. However, this ideal is often frustrated by lack of agreement on objectives and by separation of the three major groups into competing power factions.[12]

Stoup has pointed out two major areas of stress and conflict within the hierarchy of the college. The first is between the faculty and the administration and the second is between the students and the rest of the institution.[13] Obviously, this places the students at the bottom of the hierarchy as one can readily see when examining the organizational chart of the college. Within the bureaucratic structure, students are largely regarded as consumers and as such they do not hold as important, intrinsic, or as permanent a relationship to the hierarchy as do the employees of the college.[14] Therefore, they often tend to be regarded as out-groups by those who are firmly entrenched in the hierarchy.

If one understands university and college governance on the grand scale as a political process in which different power blocks - outside

---

[10] Hawes, op. cit., p. 124.

[11] "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin: (Winter, 1966), p. 376.

[12] Jenks, op. cit., p. 336.

[13] Herbert Stoup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education, (New York: Free Press, 1966), p. 85.

[14] Ibid.

pressure groups, trustees, administrators, faculty and students - struggle for some control over the institution's destiny, it is not at all mysterious or shocking that students should be flexing their collective muscles.[15] Student power, therefore, is a natural thing alongside many other kinds of power.

Griswold quoted Randall Jarrell as characterizing the relations between faculty and students by stating that the one allowance the faculty never, under any circumstances, ever made was that the students might be right about something and they wrong.[16] This does not seem to be the case at Trenton State College where student participation in policy development is welcome by the college community as a whole. Although the student participation may not be completely and graciously accepted by all members of the faculty and administration, it is recognized as a fact of life.

Stoup has defined "Policy" as those standards and agreements which are guiding principles for the operation of the college.[17] Baldridge states that "Policies" are those decisions that bind an organization to important courses of action.[18] Through these definitions, one can see why policies are considered important by all power groups and why they will make every effort to see that their special values are implemented through policy decisions. Therefore, when policy becomes a major point of conflict, partisan activity begins to permeate the university and as a result, the particular policy becomes the center of political analysis.[19]

---

[15] Baldridge, op. cit., p. 79.

[16] Whitney A. Griswold, Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal and Other Essays, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p. 131-132.

[17] Stoup, op. cit., p. 103.

[18] Baldridge, op. cit., p. 21.

[19] Ibid.

In order to understand the political process of policy development, one must examine how the social structure of the college influences the policy process system, how political pressures are brought on decision makers, how decisions are forged out of conflict, and how the policies, once established, are implemented. With this being the focus of the study, Baldridge's Political Model, as mentioned earlier, was applied to the political processes involved in the development of the Student Class Attendance Policy of Trenton State College.

PROCEDURES

The nature of this study required a research methodology that included interviews and the examination of documents related to the development of the new Student Class Attendance Policy. The sixteen major figures involved in the developmental process of the policy were interviewed and are listed below according to their status within the college:

Administrators

President
Vice-President of Academic Affairs
Assistant to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs
Dean of the School of Arts and Science
Assistant to the Dean of the School of Education
Director of the Division of Business
Director of the Division of Industrial Education and Technology

Faculty

Professors (2)
Associate Professors (3)
Assistant Professors (1)

Students

Seniors (2)
Juniors (1)

Three of the faculty members and two of the students listed above held the following positions in various legislative groups:

Chairman of the Academic Policies Committee

President of the Faculty Senate
Chairman of the Academic Affairs Council of the Faculty Senate
President of the Student Government Association
Vice-President of the Student Government Association

The interview instrument was constructed according to Baldridge's Political Model and was utilized through the following sequence of questions:

Interview Instrument

A. What were the social conditions that precipitated the proposal for a change in the student class attendance policy?

B. How did the initial proposal develop?

1. Where did it originate?

2. What individuals or groups were involved?

3. What was the text of the initial proposal?

C. Where was the initial proposal first articulated within the policy development system of the college?

1. How was it articulated?

2. What pressures were brought to bear?

3. What individuals or groups resisted the proposal?

4. What conflicts developed?

5. What were the effects of the conflicts on the initial proposal?

D. What legislative bodies became involved in the transformation of the proposal into official policy?

E. What compromises were made within these legislative bodies in order to resolve conflict and reach a definitive policy statement?

F. What was the text of the final policy statement on student class attendance?

G. Do you feel that the policy statement in its final form was acceptable to the majority of your constituency? Why was it acceptable or unacceptable?

H. What problems do you expect to be generated by the

implementation and execution of the new policy?

4. In retrospect, what situations occurred, did not occur or should have occurred within the development of this policy that may provide direction for improvement of the policy development system of the college?

In addition to the interviews, seventeen documents that were related to the developmental process of the policy were examined in an effort to acquire background material and factual information. This examination included the following:

Documents:

College Catalogue
College Newspapers
Correspondence between Individuals
Correspondence between Groups
Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee meetings
Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting
Student Handbook
Student Position Papers

RESULTS

The findings that resulted from the interviews and the examination of documents related to the new Student Class Attendance Policy are presented below according to Baldridge's Political Model. This approach served the analytical purpose of the study as it relates to the political processes involved in the development of the policy. Therefore, the analytical presentation of the findings begins with Social Structure which concerns the conditions that precipitated the initial proposal for a change in the student class attendance policy.

Prior to the development of the new student attendance policy, attendance regulations were determined by each individual professor. The Student Handbook of 1974-75 stated that the philosophy of Trenton State College perceives success in the class as being closely related to student attendance and therefore, the instructor in each course is responsible for

explaining his attendance policy.[20] This placed the determination of attendance regulations on each professor since there was really no college policy that mandated attendance. The system was very loose and as a result, there were a variety of attendance policies.[21] Therefore, it was possible for a student to find a different attendance regulation in each course he or she was carrying during a semester.

Students would find that some professors had no concern for attendance and therefore they never called roll for attendance purposes. When roll was called in these situations, it was for the purpose of learning the names of students. However, other professors took attendance at each class session and used the student's attendance record as a criterion for academic evaluation.[22] Students found that in this situation their final grade in a course was often lowered one grade level if they had three absences, two grade levels if they had four absences on to automatic failure when absences were excessive.[23] This practice occurred regardless of the student's academic performance and his demonstration of subject matter mastery through examinations, term papers and other completed requirements.

These attendance practices were considered unfair when the course involved lecture methods that permitted no discussion and/or participation on the part of the students.[24] The students felt that they could perform well in these courses by completing the assigned readings and supplementary

---

[20] Trenton State College 1974-75 Directory and Student Handbook, Ervin Associates, Inc. 1974, p. 22.

[21] Interview No. 11, p. 1.

[22] Interview No. 14, p. 1.

[23] Interview No. 6, p. 1.

[24] Interview No. 9, p. 1.

readings and not attending class. They felt that nothing new beyond the readings occurred in class and therefore, they were not missing anything.

The students also viewed these attendance practices as part of the Loco Parentis syndrome.[25] They rejected this because they felt that they were mature enough to decide for themselves the value of attending the classes of a particular course and mandatory attendance denied them the right of making that decision.

Although these personal reasons were advanced as the purpose for changing the attendance policy, there was also an organizational purpose which was related to the newly established Student Government Association. Since this organization was in its first year of existence, the proposal for a change in the attendance policy was also an attempt to assert the power of the Student Government Association and prove to the college community that the students were a political force that could influence institutional policy.[26] Therefore, two of the students involved in the developmental process of the new policy saw that a change in the attendance policy would be a victory for the Student Government Association. Also, they viewed a victory as a good election campaign for achieving office in the Student Government Association.[27] This was of particular interest to one of the students who, during the developmental process of the policy, was serving as Vice-President of the organization and was planning to run for the office of President.

The Interest Articulation aspect of this policy as related to the Baldridge Model began with the two students mentioned above. Through

---

[25] Interview No. 3, p. 1.

[26] Interview No. 7, p. 1.

[27] Interview No. 8, p. 1.

their role as members of the Academic Policies Committee of the college, they had gained some experience with the policy development process of the college. This experience provided the students with some direction in their efforts to express their interest in changing the attendance policy. Therefore, the Vice-President of the Student Government Association met with the Vice-President of the college in charge of Academic Affairs on October 5, 1973 for the purpose of discussing student concerns about several academic policies. Since both figures were members of the Academic Policies Committee, the meeting was an attempt by the students to get advice and determine the administrative support they would have in their efforts to change policy on attendance.[28]

The October 10 issue of the college newspaper reported on this meeting and articulated, to the college community, the students interest in changing the class attendance policy. The article quoted the Vice-President of the Student Government Association as saying to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs:

> ... we don't feel that professors should have requirements subject to attendance; that is to say if you don't come to class you get a zero. We feel that's an immature approach to education and does not belong in any college. It is something out of grammar school or high school and we want it changed.[29]

The article also stated that the Vice-President of Academic Affairs was

---

[28] Interview No. 9, p. 1.

[29] The Signal (Trenton State College), October 10, 1973, p. 3, col. 6.

in agreement with the statement.[30]

The second attempt in articulating this concern was in the form of a position paper on academic policies that was prepared by the Vice-President of the Student Government Association and a Student Senator who was also a member of the Academic Policies Committee. The paper, which was presented to the Academic Policies Committee on February 27, 1974, stated that:

> Attendance requirements by professors promote student degradation by precluding the valuable option by students to determine the worth of a class to his or her needs. Such a requirement is predicated on the fallacious assumption that a professor's lecture is beneficial to all enrolled students at all times. This dogmatism is an outgrowth of nineteenth century education which has no place in a modern day edification process. The student is now prompted to critically think. The attendance requirements latently contradict this concept by preventing students the most fundamental decision of choosing whether the class is consistent with his or her objectives.[31]

Although this item was only discussed briefly by the Committee, the college newspaper, in its March 6 issue, carried a front page article entitled "End to Mandatory Attendance Near."[32] This article further

---

[30]Ibid.

[31]Student Position Paper on Academic Policies, presented to the Academic Policies Committee, February 27, 1974, p. 2.

[32]The Signal (Trenton State College), March 6, 1974, p. 1, col. 1.

articulated the student interest in changing the attendance policy.

The dynamics by which the students articulated interests were translated into policy involve the Legislative Phase of the Baldridge Model. This phase began with the Academic Policies Committee meeting on April 26, 1974. The minutes of this meeting showed discussion of the attendance item of the position paper and the proposal that:

> Class attendance should not be part of the grade nor should class participation be graded except in laboratory classes, seminars and cooperative education.[33]

The discussion centered on the responsibilities of both faculty and students under the proposal and the consequences and implications of such a policy.[34] At the conclusion of the meeting, the students agreed to revise the proposal for presentation at the next meeting.

The students returned to the Academic Policies Committee on May 3, 1974 and presented a formal motion concerning the mandatory attendance question. The motion was:

> No faculty member can directly or indirectly require in any form a student to attend his or her classroom activities unless the student is assigned to present a report or project before the class.
>
> a) This motion precludes the faculty option of reducing a student's grade due to a lack of class participation.

---

[33] Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, April 26, 1974, p. 2.

[34] Ibid.

b) Cooperative education and laboratory work are not a part of classroom activities and hence this motion does not apply to those areas.[35]

The motion brought immediate response from those faculty members who were opposed to such a change in attendance regulations. Some faculty members saw this as a violation of their academic freedom.[36] However, major opposition and conflict came from faculty members of departments that involved laboratory and studio experiences in their courses.[37] Some faculty members thought that the proposal would affect the content and procedures of their courses, while others felt that class attendance in and of itself was important to a college education.[38]

Arguments for and against the proposed policy change finally led to compromise that was achieved through a rephrasing of the initial motion. The rewritten motion was:

> Every student in the college is encouraged to attend every class lecture and lab section in each of his courses according to the announced attendance policy of the instructor of that course; no policy may be formulated in which attendance per se is used as a criterion for academic evaluation. Grading standards must be clearly explained by each professor for each

---

[35] Mandatory Attendance Question, presented to the Academic Policies Committee, May 3, 1974, p. 2.

[36] Interview No. 3, p. 2.

[37] Interview No. 5, p. 1.

[38] Interview No. 4, p. 1.

class section at the opening of each semester.[39]

This rephrased policy statement on attendance was moved by a faculty member, seconded by a student and was approved by all members of the Committee who were present when the vote was taken.[40]

The next step within the policy development system of the college was for this new policy statement to be recommended to the President of the College for approval and implementation. However, this did not occur immediately because of opposition that had not been expressed due primarily to a communication problem between the Academic Policies Committee and the faculty as a whole.[41] Many faculty members were not aware of the policy change until after the fact.[42] They learned of the new policy change through the May 8 issue of the college newspaper which carried a front page article entitled "Mandatory Class Attendance Dropped."[43] This article reviewed background information on the policy change, presented the new policy statement as approved by the Academic Policies Committee and praised members of the Committee for their open-mindedness and flexibility. As a result of this article, new interest in the form of faculty opposition was generated.

On May 14, 1974, the President of the Faculty Senate sent a letter to the President of the College expressing the concern of the faculty in regard to the new policy statement on attendance and requesting that the implementation of the policy be withheld until it can be reviewed by all

---

[39] Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, May 3, 1974, p. 2.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Interview No. 7, p. 3.

[42] Interview No. 1, p. 4.

[43] The Signal (Trenton State College), May 8, 1974, p. 1, col. 5.

departments and evaluated by the Faculty Senate.[44] This action by the Faculty Senate brought pressure on the Academic Policies Committee and as a result, the Chairman of the Committee visited numerous department meetings to explain the policy and its implications.[45] As a result of faculty input through these meetings, the Academic Policies Committee met on May 28, 1974 and amended the attendance policy statement to read:

> Every student in the college is encouraged to attend every class lecture and lab section in each of his courses according to the announced attendance policy of the instructor of that course. No policy may be formulated in which attendance per se is used as a criterion for academic evaluation. This policy does not prohibit any instructor from evaluating students based on class participation, seminar discussion, laboratory work, field experiences or the like which may take place during regularly scheduled class sessions. If these areas of evaluation involve activities which make class attendance essential, then the student may be penalized for failure to perform satisfactorily in the required activities. Grading standards must be clearly explained and presented in writing to each class at the opening of the semester.[46]

---

[44] Letter from the President of the Faculty Senate to the President of the College, May 14, 1974.

[45] Interview No. 13, p. 1.

[46] Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, May 28, 1974, p. 2-3.

With the amended material underlined, the policy statement was sent to the President of the College by the Chairman of the Academic Policies Committee.[47] At this point, The President could have sent the policy statement to the Board of Trustees with his recommendation for approval and implementation. However, the President complied with the request of the President of the Faculty Senate and sent the policy statement to the Senate for further legislative review. Through such a review, The President could be certain that the policy statement had been examined completely by those who would be most directly affected by it, and that his recommendation of the policy to the Board of Trustees would have their support.[48]

Student reaction to this move by the President and the Faculty Senate was reported through a front page article in the college newspaper entitled "Attendance Abolishment Blocked By Faculty." This article presented the recent developments concerning faculty opposition to the new policy statement on attendance, and expressed concern for a positive outcome.[49] The editorial of that issue of the newspaper criticized the Faculty Senate for establishing a "Dangerous Precedent" by challenging a committee's decision after the fact.[50] The Editor sharply criticized the President of the College for his action and vehemently opposed any review of this policy statement by the Faculty Senate. The general feeling among students was that this action by the Faculty Senate was an usurpation of their right to participate in policy development since the student body had no representation in the Faculty Senate. Therefore, their right to serve on

---

[47] Letter from the Chairman of the Academic Policies Committee to the President of the College, May 30, 1974.

[48] Interview No. 16, p. 3.

[49] The Signal (Trenton State College), July 17, 1974, p. 1, col. 6.

[50] Ibid, p. 4, col. 1.

standing committees of the college with voting privileges became worthless when the Faculty Senate could challenge and even change committee decisions and recommendations to the President of the College.[51]

Regardless of these attempts to bring pressure on the President and the Faculty Senate, the policy statement was given to the Academic Affairs Council of the Faculty Senate for evaluation. On October 9, 1974, the Council presented to the Faculty Senate the following resolution on student attendance:

> Every student in the college is encouraged to attend every class lecture and lab section in each of his courses according to the announced attendance policy of the instructor of that course; no policy may be formulated in which attendance per se is used as a criterion for academic evaluation. This policy does not prohibit any instructor from evaluating students based on class participation, seminar discussion, laboratory work, field experiences or the like which may take place during regularly scheduled class sessions. If these areas for evaluation involve activities which make class attendance essential, then the student may be penalized for failure to perform satisfactorily in the required activities. <u>The criteria for determining the final grade</u> must be clearly explained and presented in writing <u>by the professor</u> to each class section at the opening of the semester.[52]

---

[51] Interview No. 8, p. 3.

[52] <u>Minutes</u>, Faculty Senate, October 9, 1974, p. 2.

This policy statement, with its amended material underlined, was debated for an extensive period of time before the Senate voted to approve the policy in principle. The vote was 28 yes, 7 no and 3 abstentions with 7 Senators absence.[53] The Faculty Senate sent the policy statement with its endorsement to the President of the College.

With this legislative action, the Policy Outcome aspect of Baldridge's Model was reached. The articulated interests had gone through conflict and compromise stages and the final legislative action was taken by the Board of Trustees. This occurred on October 29, 1974 when the President of the College submitted the policy statement, as received from the Faculty Senate, to the Board of Trustees for approval. After some discussion of the policy, the Board of Trustees passed the New Student Class Attendance Policy.[54] The policy was then turned over to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs for execution and implementation. This involved the final stage of the developmental process of the policy and relates to the Execution of Policy phase of the Baldridge Model.

On January 13, 1975, the Vice-President of Academic Affairs sent a letter to all faculty members informing them of the New Policy on Class Attendance which was to become effective with the new semester beginning January 20, 1975.[55]

Although the execution and implementation of a new policy frequently generates new problems and a new cycle of conflict, no problems with this new attendance policy had surfaced during the time of this study. However, some of the figures who were interviewed felt that the new policy would

---

[53] Ibid.

[54] Minutes, Board of Trustees, October 29, 1974, p. 3.

[55] Letter from the Vice-President of Academic Affairs to All College Faculty, January 13, 1975.

result in student grievances against some faculty members who may not be following the policy. If this occurs, a problem with the grievance procedures may be generated because these procedures involve a policy that is relatively new and for the most part, has not been tested. Except for this concern, the general feeling of those figures who were interviewed was that the policy will work with little if any problem because it was acceptable to the majority of all constituencies.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study permitted the following conclusions to be made:

A. With the exception of some organizational problems that involved preparation, the students performed well in the policy-making process. They showed patience in the face of opposition and conflict and this, coupled with their persistence and willingness to compromise, helped them achieve their objective.

B. The major problem in the developmental process of this policy involved ineffective communication systems between the Academic Policies Committee and the college community as a whole. This problem resulted in numerous delays and the duplication of effort by the Committee and the Faculty Senate.

C. The communication problem raised serious questions about the policy flow system and the policy-making role of the standing committees of the college and the Faculty Senate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were judged to be supported by the findings of this study:

A. In future attempts to change policy, the students can be more effective in their initial efforts by:

1. familiarizing themselves with all aspects of the policy development system of the college, and by learning the role each standing committee has within the system.
2. presenting a policy proposal with concomitant research that supports the proposal.
3. seeking the support of all constituencies rather than attempting to play one group against another.
4. passing all proposed policy changes through the Student Government Association before presenting them to the appropriate standing committee of the college.

B. The standing committees of the college should:

1. establish better communication lines with all constituencies of the college by publishing their minutes of each meeting.
2. hold open hearings for all constituencies on any possible change in existing policy or the development of a new policy.

C. To keep conflict between constituencies at a minimum and improve the policy development system, the college should:

1. establish a definitive policy flow process that is clear to all members of the college community.
2. define the exact role of all standing committees and legislative bodies within the policy development process.

By instituting these recommendations, the college can:

A. Insure all constituencies that changes in policy, as reflected by this study, can occur within the system when a concerted effort is made by any one constituency.

B. Improve the total policy development process of the college and prove that the mechanisms of the system work best through representation and intellectual compromise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldridge, Victor J. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Carroll, Joseph and others. Report of the Policy Study Commission of Trenton State College. New Jersey: Trenton State College Printing, 1974.

Eckert, Ruth E. "Participation in University Policy-Making: A Second Look," AAUP Bulletin, LVI (September, 1970), 308-314.

Hawes, L. C. and H. R. Trux. "Student Participation in the University Decision Making Process," Journal of Higher Education, XLV (February, 1974), 123-134.

Griswold, Whitney A. Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal and Other Essays. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Jenks, R. S. "Faculty-Student Participation in University Government: A Case History," Educational Record, LIV (Summer, 1973), 236-242.

Mandatory Attendance Question, Academic Policies Committee, Trenton State College, May 3, 1974.

Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, Trenton State College, April 26, 1974.

Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, Trenton State College, May 3, 1974.

Minutes, Academic Policies Committee, Trenton State College, May 28, 1974.

Minutes, Board of Trustees, Trenton State College, October 29, 1974.

Minutes, Faculty Senate, Trenton State College, October 9, 1974.

Student Position Paper on Academic Policies, Academic Policies Committee, Trenton State College, February 27, 1974.

The Signal (Trenton State College), October 10, 1973.

The Signal (Trenton State College), May 8, 1974.

The Signal (Trenton State College), July 17, 1974.

Trenton State College. Personal correspondence between the President of the Faculty Senate and the President of the College. May 14, 1974.

Trenton State College. Personal correspondence between the Chairman of the Academic Policies Committee and the President of the College. May 30, 1974.

Trenton State College. Personal correspondence between the Vice-President of Academic Affairs and the College Faculty. January 13, 1975.

Trenton State College 1974-75 Directory and Student Handbook. Ervin Associates, Inc., 1974.

Stoup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: Free Press, 1966.

"Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin, (Winter, 1966), 376.